

Allowed Claims

As a preliminary matter, the applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 18-22.

Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koepp, U.S. Patent No. 3,636,385. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Koepp discloses a circuit for protecting a P-channel enhancement type metal oxide semi-conducting transistor 16 from rupturing due to static voltages (see abstract, lines 1-3). A negative voltage is constantly applied to the gates of N-channel depletion type transistors 36 and 38; as a result, a low resistance path constantly prevents static voltage from building up above a negligible value (see column 3, lines 30-37).

Amended claim 1 of the present application is directed to a device for protecting a circuit against voltage surges, comprising a MOS transistor of a first type directly connected to first and second supply terminals by its source and its drain, respectively, a MOS transistor of a second type directly connected between the second supply terminal and the gate of the transistor of the first type by its source and its drain, respectively, and a capacitor having a first terminal directly connected to the first supply terminal and a second terminal directly connected to the gate of the transistor of the second type. The transistor of the first type shunts the voltage surges between the supply terminals in response to the voltage surges. Since Koepp discloses a circuit that provides a low resistance path constantly, preventing static voltages from building up above a negligible value, voltage surges are prevented. Therefore, Koepp does not teach, disclose or suggest how to shunt the voltage surges between the supply terminals in response to the voltage surges because the voltage surges do not occur in the first place. Therefore, independent claim 1 in its present form is believed to be in allowable condition, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 and 27-33 depend from independent claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Also, claims 34-39 depend from allowed independent claim 18, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Added Claims

Support for added claims 27-39 is found in the specification page 6 (lines 31-35), page 7 (lines 1-7) and Figure 3.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this responses, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to the deposit account number 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,

Serge PONTAROLLO

By: 

James H. Morris

Reg. No. 34,681

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, MA 02210-2211

Tel. No. (617) 720-3500

Attorneys for Applicant

Attorney's Docket No.: S1022/7556

Dated September 22, 1998